



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,789	12/13/2001	Jan Willum Nielsen	8465/17	1127
7590	11/19/2003		EXAMINER	BIANCO, PATRICIA
David Rozenblat BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/017,789	NIELSEN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Patricia M Bianco	3762	. w.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 11-33 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 11,14-18,21,23-26,29,30 and 33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 12,13,22,27,28,31 and 32 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: *Detailed Action*.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The preliminary amendment filed 12/13/01 amended the specification to include a statement of priority, cancelled original claims 1-10, and added new claims 11-33.

Claims 11-33 are currently pending and have been examined on the merits.

Claim Objections

Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: in lines 3-4 the "operatin ghandle" appears to be a grammatical error. Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

Applicant has indicated co-pending applications in the first paragraph of the specification. The first page of the specification should be updated to clarify the status of all related applications noted in the first paragraph of the specification. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. _____" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 11, 14-18, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30 & 33 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. **6,355,021 B1**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the application claims are a broader recitation of the invention than that of the issued patent, including all of the same limitations. The claims match up as follows:

Application claims 11, 26 & 33 are a broader recitation than patent claims 1 or 2;

Application claim 14 is a broader recitation than patent claim 3;

Application claims 15, 16 & 19 are a broader recitation than patent claims 4 or 5;

Application claim 21 is a broader recitation than patent claim 3;

Application claims 24 & 25 are a broader recitation than patent claims 4 or 5;

Application claims 29 & 30 are a broader recitation than patent claim 3.

The infusion device of the application claims includes all the same structural limitations in a broader recitation than the infusion device of the patent so the two are only slightly different. Since a broad interpretation of the patent claims includes the infusion device of the patent claims, if a patent was to grant on the pending claims of this application applicant would be granted an unlawful extension of protection beyond the years of the '021 patent. With respect to claims 17 & 23, it would have been obvious to modify the patent claims such that the hub would be made of plastic material as the chosen material at the time of the invention, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability as a matter of obvious design choice. Further, it is well known in the art to fabricate hubs out of plastic since it is relatively inexpensive.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12, 13, 22, 27, 28, 31 & 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning the rejections contained within this communication or earlier communications should be directed to examiner Tricia Bianco whose telephone number is (703) 305-1482. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fridays, alternating Fridays off, from 9:00 AM until 6:30 PM.

Art Unit: 3762

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on (703) 308-5181. The official fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for regular and After Final communications.

Tricia Bianco
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3762

pmb *Tricia Bianco*
November 15th, 2003